

Message

From: Nassif, Julianne (DPH) [/O=COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS/OU=MASSMAIL-01/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=JULIANNE.NASSIF]
Sent: 3/22/2010 1:24:21 PM
To: Piro, Peter (DPH) [/O=COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS/OU=MassMail-01/cn=Recipients/cn=Peter.Piro]; Salemi, Charles (DPH) [/O=COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS/OU=MassMail-01/cn=Recipients/cn=Charles.Salemi]
Subject: RE: CW v. [REDACTED]

excellent, thank you.

From: Piro, Peter (DPH)
Sent: Monday, March 22, 2010 8:36 AM
To: Salemi, Charles (DPH); Nassif, Julianne (DPH)
Subject: FW: CW v. [REDACTED]

The defense attorney focused on contamination and how we could be certain the instrument was working properly. He was also interested in knowing who repaired the instruments (my qualifications, formal training and how I would make assessments) and when the instrument in question received maintenance, especially around the time his sample was analyzed. My response focused on how we qualify an instrument for use by evaluating instrument QC parameters and GC/MS method QC. I also gave a brief overview of the buildings QA/QC program to lend credibility to my testimony.

From: McDonough, Matthew (NFK)
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010 12:55 PM
To: Salemi, Charles (DPH); Nassif, Julianne (DPH)
Cc: Saunders, Della (DPH); Piro, Peter (DPH); Renczkowski, Daniel (DPH)
Subject: CW v. [REDACTED]

Charles & Julianne,

My name is Matt McDonough. I am an Assistant District Attorney in Norfolk County. Two weeks ago I had a jury trial for cocaine trafficking and possession with intent marijuana against [REDACTED]. Defense counsel on the case refused to stipulate to chain of custody or to admission of the narcotics involved. So, what could have been a 2 witness trial became much more involved and I had to call three of your colleagues to testify. Della Saunders, Peter Piro and Dan Renczkowski all testified as to their training and experience, the policies and procedures of your department and the results of the testing of the substances in this case. I write to share with you how impressed I was with their testimony. All three analysts were professional, informed and polished witnesses who did not allow the defense attorney to create even one inconsistency in their testimony. The manner in which they handled cross-examination was consistent with police witnesses with hundreds of trials under their belt. Following the Melendez-Diaz decision, I was unsure what to expect from the testimony of analysts, but if the rest of your department is as good on the stand as Dan, Della and Peter, I look forward to trying many more drug cases with your staff. If you have any questions for me, please email me or call me at (781)830-4800 ext 281.

Thank you,
Matt